

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent telephonic interview held on July 22. The claim amendments and arguments submitted in this paper are consistent with the amendments and arguments presented during the course of the interview. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested. Applicants also note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the application includes allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 3-36 and 41-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Carson et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0093326 A1), hereinafter *Carson*, in view of Copperman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,711,585 B1) hereinafter *Copperman* and further in view of Szabo (U.S. Pat. No. 7181438 B1), hereinafter *Szabo*. Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carson et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0093326 A1), hereinafter *Carson*, in view of Copperman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,711,585 B1) hereinafter *Copperman* and further in view of Szabo (U.S. Pat. No. 7181438 B1), hereinafter *Szabo* and further in view *Decombe* (U.S. Pat. No. 8,888,554 B1).¹

By this amendment claims 1, 17 and 28 have been amended and claims 46-51 have been added.² Claim 44 has been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-36 and 45-51 are pending, of which claims 1, 17 and 28 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to obtaining web service information for one or more related web services represented at different nodes in the taxonomy. For example, claim 1 defines receiving a request for web service information, the request including a user entered reference node identifier and relationship data indicating a first and a second hierarchical relationship the requested node is to have with the reference node, the user entered reference node identifier identifying a specified web service represented at a reference node within the taxonomy, the relationship data indicating that any related web service in any taxonomy having either the first or second specified hierarchical relationship with the specified web service is a

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0007], [0009], [0050], [0055], [0057] and Figures 3 & 5.

related web service of interest to the user. Next, claim 1 defines extracting the reference node identifier and the relationship data from the request.

Claim 1 further defines querying one or more databases in a plurality of different taxonomies located on one or more different computer systems using the relationship data to obtain web service information for any web services having at least one the first and the second specified hierarchical relationship with the specified web service of the reference node, the web service information being presentable in a hierarchical format, the hierarchy being based on the specified web service's hierarchical relationship with the reference node and other web services in the plurality of different taxonomies, the nodes of each database comprising at least one of a plurality of root nodes and receiving web service information that corresponds to an equivalent node in a second, different taxonomy in response to the query, the equivalent node providing the same web service as the reference node as indicated in an equivalence relationship tag, the received web service information being displayable in a navigable taxonomy. Lastly, claim 1 defines returning the received web service information to the client, the received web service information for graphical presentation at the client to show a user relevant portions of any of the plurality of taxonomies that included related web services.

Claim 17 is a method claim similar to claim 1, but from the perspective of a client. Claim 28 is a system claim similar to claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 Rejections

Carson describes providing a taxonomy for mobile electronic services (MES's). *Carson* notes that, from a client's perspective, MES providers often appear and disappear at random intervals (for example, as a client is traveling in and out of wireless service cells). Thus, the availability of e-services can change frequently (par. [0009]). *Carson* describes a system for a taxonomy to describe MES's using a tree structure for organizing descriptive characteristics of the MES (par. [0010]). *Carson* further describes a method for searching MES's by searching each category of MES's (par. [0011]). Various service level identifiers may be used to supply service-related information such as rating, revenue model, and price (par. [0070]). Ultimately, *Carson* is designed to search for specific e-services and does so by searching a taxonomy in a

top-down fashion, starting with the root node and extending to the leaf nodes (par. [0075]). *Carson* is silent on allowing a user to specify a reference node and finding other, equivalent nodes in other taxonomies.

Copperman teaches a method and system for organizing and retrieving information using taxonomies. For example, in a system where there are multiple documents, document text is searched and associated with a corresponding taxonomy, depending on how related the text is to the taxonomy (Abs.). For example, there may be a document source taxonomy and an intended audience taxonomy (Figs. 10 & 11, Col. 30:32-Col. 31:22). *Copperman* uses initial taxonomy tags to indicate the broad concept for the search and interest taxonomy tags that specify how the results are to be ranked as determined by the strength of association between the concept and the document text (Col. 6:46-63). The more related the document text is to the concept represented by the initial taxonomy tag, the higher the document will rank in relation to that concept in the taxonomy. Like *Carson* however, *Copperman* is designed to search for specific informational tags in a top-down fashion, starting at the initial taxonomy tag and extending to those leaf nodes below the initial taxonomy tag. *Copperman* is likewise silent on allowing a user to specify a reference node and finding other, equivalent nodes in other taxonomies.

Szabo is cited to show a web service being displayed in a navigable taxonomy. *Szabo*, describes a computer user interface navigational system for examining data units stored in the memory of a computer system (Col. 17:19-34). In the navigational system, the user interface shows a visual representation of the hierarchical structure of the data units in computer system memory. *Szabo*, however, does not mention web services or services of any kind. *Szabo* further fails to mention navigating a system that has multiple different nodes in different taxonomies, where each node offers (potentially) different web services. Moreover, similar to *Carson* and *Copperman*, *Szabo* is silent on allowing a user to specify a reference node and finding other, equivalent nodes in other taxonomies.

Thus, none of the cited art teaches or suggests receiving web service information that corresponds to an equivalent node in a second, different taxonomy in response to the query, the equivalent node providing the same web service as the reference node as indicated in an equivalence relationship tag, the received web service information being displayable in a navigable taxonomy, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, none of the cited art teaches or suggests returning the received web service information to the client, the received web service

information for graphical presentation at the client to show a user relevant portions of any of the plurality of taxonomies that included related web services, as recited in claim 1. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 17 and 28 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 17 and 28, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

Although each of the dependent claims patentably define over the prior art of record for the same reasons as their corresponding base claims, many of the dependent claims also independently distinguish over the prior art of record. For example, the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest graphically displaying the web service information in a navigable taxonomy, allowing the client to manually navigate through each node of the taxonomy, as recited in claim 50.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 8 day of August, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gregory R. Lunt/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973